

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner stated that claims 1-5, 8-18, and 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al (U.S. Patent: 6,567,787) in view of Rtischev et al (U.S. Patent: 5,634,086).

The Examiner stated that claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al in view of Rtischev et al, and further in view of Surace et al (U.S. Patent: 6,144,938).

The Examiner stated that claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al in view of Rtischev et al, and further in view of Kennedy et al (U.S. Patent: 6,167,255).

The Examiner stated that, “although the panels utilized by the application, which contain discrete portions of a telemarketing call script and are divided according to panel timestamps (pages 18 and 22) of the specification) may differ from the script portions disclosed by Rtischev, such panels have not been claimed.” Applicant thanks the Examiner for addressing this point and has thus amended claims 1 and 18 accordingly.

The Examiner stated that, “...the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the specific telemarketing call script panels corresponding to a single offer of a good or service, Amendment, Page 6) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).” Applicant thanks the Examiner for addressing this point and has thus amended claims 1 and 18 accordingly.

As such, Applicant believes currently amended claims 1 and 18, as well as the claims that depend from them overcome Walker, Rtischev, as well as the rest of the cited art, and respectfully request they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WEST CORPORATION

Appl. No. 09/785,048
Amdt. dated 07/24/2006
Reply to Office action of 05/23/2006

Dated: July 24, 2006

By: /Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian, Jr.
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: (972) 849-1310



29129

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

11808 Miracle Hills Drive
Omaha, Nebraska 68154
(402) 965-7077